

REMARKS

The above amendment and these remarks are responsive to the Office Action of Examiner James A. Kramer, dated 14 Jan 2004.

Claims 1-17 are in the case, none as yet allowed.

Specification

Applicants have amended the specification to provide citations for copending applications and to correct various spelling errors without the introduction of new matter.

Applicants request that the amendments to the specification be entered.

35 U.S.C. 102

Claims 1, 4, 5, 6, 7, 10 and 11 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) over Maners.

Applicants invention relates to a method and system for invoice authorization by the original requester, with invoices presented to the requester in a particularly useful and user friendly manner whether such invoices are received hard copy or by EDI. These concepts are explained in applicants' specification, for example, at page 16, line 20 to page 19, line 10.

Maners U.S. Patent 6,507,826 B1 relates to EDI processing, which is automation between computer systems. A system is required at both the vendor and at the customer side. Maners describes an "agent" that authorizes payment of invoices.

Applicants have amended these claims to clarify that their system and method provides for having the individual who created the original order make the determination that the resulting invoice from the vendor should be paid (or not). In applicants' invention, unlike Maners "agent",

there is no centralization of payment authorization.

Applicants urge that claims 1, 4, 5, 6, 7, 10 and 11 be allowed.

35 U.S.C. 103

Claim 3 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over Maners in view of Official Notice.

Claims 2, 8 and 9 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over Maners in view of Cukor et al. (hereinafter Cukor).

With respect to claim 3, the Maners reference has been distinguished with respect to its parent claim 1.

With respect to claims 2, 8 and 9, Cukor describes the management and processing of shipping transactions via image processing. The workflow does not address any associated business workflow, such as payment or reconciliation of goods received. It does offer a detailed breakdown of how

imaging systems can reduce the large amount of paper (and error) usually associated with such processing. However, it does not describe any end-user decision points for paying for goods received, particularly on the claimed point that such decision is made by the original requester.

Applicants request that claims 2-3 and 8-9 be allowed.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

Applicants urge that the above amendments be entered and the case passed to issue with claims 1-17.

The Application is believed to be in condition for allowance and such action by the Examiner is urged. Should differences remain, however, which do not place one/more of the remaining claims in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to phone the undersigned at the number provided below for the purpose of providing constructive assistance and suggestions in accordance with M.P.E.P. Sections 707.02(j) and 707.03 in order that allowable claims can be presented, thereby placing the Application in

condition for allowance without further proceedings being necessary.

Sincerely,

T. A. Aber, et al.

By


Shelley M. Beckstrand
Reg. No. 24,886

Date: 14 Apr 2004

Shelley M Beckstrand, P.C.
Attorney at Law
314 Main Street
Owego, NY 13827

Phone: (607) 687-9913
Fax: (607) 687-7848